

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/726,352	12/02/2003	Raymond W. Blodgett JR.	18393-302	9022	
37374 7	590 06/29/2006		EXAMINER		
INSKEEP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP, INC			KRUER, STEFAN		
2281 W. 190T SUITE 200	H STREET		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	TORRANCE, CA 90504			3654	
			DATE MAILED: 06/29/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/726,352	BLODGETT ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
•	Stefan Kruer	3654					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app							
Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 M	<u>ay 2006</u> .						
,-							
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) 1 - 21 is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>2 - 4, 6, 12 - 13, 15 - 19, and 21</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.  5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1, 5, 7 - 11, 14 and 20</u> is/are rejected.							
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1</u> is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>12 December 2003</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:							
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachment(s)	,, <b>,</b> , , , ,	(DTO 440)					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)     Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	-: [ <sup></sup> ]	Patent Application (PTO-152)					

Application/Control Number: 10/726,352 Page 2

Art Unit: 3654

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

Claims 2 – 4, 6, 12 – 13, 15 - 19 and 21 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention and species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on 4 May 2006.

Although **Claim 21** is indicated by applicant as being readable on the elected species, the claim has the safety latch, which is not a features of the elected species.

## Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: "to" of the infinitives "support and constrain" is missing. Appropriate correction is required.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 5, 7 – 11 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rice et al (4,353,436) in view of Anderson et al (2,187,90).

Re: Claim 1, Rice et al disclose:

- a frame (including 36, 38, 50, 52, 28 and 30, Fig. 1),
- an acme screw (68, Fig. 3) secured to said frame,
- a bracket assemblage (70, Fig. 4) slidably disposed on said frame, said bracket sized and shaped so as to support and constrain rotation of his retention members (74), thereby requiring said bracket assemblage to slide when said acme screw is rotated,
- and said assemblage having a payload flange (46) for supporting a payload;

Art Unit: 3654

however, Rice et al do not disclose a primary acme nut.

Attention is directed to Anderson et al (2,187,90) who teach their primary acme nut (22) for co-axial movement along their acme screw (12).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to modify the invention of Rice et al with the teaching of Anderson et al to incorporate a primary acme nut in lieu of the retention members, for the advantage of durability.

**Re: Claim 5**, Rice et al disclose their payload (192) as an inner platform for positioning a wheel chair and Anderson et al disclose their payload as an elevator car; nevertheless, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to accommodate a bed in lieu of a wheel chair or structurally larger, heavier payload.

Re: Claims 7 and 14, Rice et al is silent regarding indicia of failure.

Anderson et al disclose their indicia of failure (34, Fig. 2) of their primary nut whereby their motor circuit is broken "...before the wear on the threads 27 becomes dangerous..." whereby visual alerting means in lieu an automatic shut-off to alert the user are offered as well (Col. 2, Line 43).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Rice et al with the teaching of Anderson et al to afford the user either or both an automatic or visual means to warn of potential catastrophic failure.

Re: Claim 8, Rice et al disclose their hand crank (110, Fig. 1).

Re: Claim 9, Rice et al disclose their electric motor (56, Fig. 1).

Re: Claim 10, Rice et al disclose their linear actuator system (Fig. 3) comprising:

- at least one acme screw (68) rotatably fixed to a framework (including 38, 50, 52, 28 and 30, Fig. 1) in a vehicle (26),
- a support system (including 36, 46, 70, Fig. 4) mounted on said frame work and slidable along said at least one acme screw,
- a payload (40, Fig. 3) coupled to said support system,
- and said at least one acme screw rotatably confined and supported on said support system (Fig.'s 3 and 4);

Application/Control Number: 10/726,352

Art Unit: 3654

however, Rice et al disclose their retention members (74) engaged with the threads of their at least one acme screw, in lieu of an acme nut.

Attention is directed to Anderson et al (2,187,90) who teach their primary acme nut (22) for co-axial movement along their acme screw (12).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to modify the invention of Rice et al with the teaching of Anderson et al to incorporate a primary acme nut in lieu of the retention members for durability.

Re: Claim 11, Rice et al disclose two acme screws (Fig. 1).

Re: Claim 20, Rice et al disclose their elongated flexible support (42, Fig. 3).

## Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Eryou et al (5,154,569), Klausmeyer (1,573,551) and Pawlak (6,557,431) are cited for reference of a lifting device in a vehicle having plural frame supported and confined acme screws with acme nuts and sliding bracket assemblage, and inventions uniquely offering visual and electromotive indicating means to alert of the potential failure of an acme nut, respectively.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stefan Kruer whose telephone number is 571.272.5913. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kathy Matecki can be reached on 571.272.6951. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571.273.8300.

Art Unit: 3654

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866.217.9197 (toll-free).

SHK

19 June 2006

Mathy Matecki

KATHY MATECKI

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600